



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,789	11/15/2001	Joseph Celi JR.	BOC9-2001-0037 (280)	4876

7590 11/03/2003

Gregory A. Nelson
Akerman Senterfitt
222 Lakeview Avenue, Fourth Floor
P.O. Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUYNH H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2642

4

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

KS

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/003,789

Applicant(s)

CELI ET AL.

Examiner

Quynh H Nguyen

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3 and 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,560,576) in view of Chow et al. (U.S. Patent 6,535,730).

Regarding claim 1, Cohen et al. teach a method of providing active help to a user of a voice-enabled application comprising: establishing a voice browsing session between a calling party (Fig. 1, 1) and the voice browser (col. 4, lines 8-38).

However, Cohen et al. do not teach conferencing an additional party into the voice browsing session using a conference component, the conference providing a voice communications link between the calling party and the additional party.

Chow et al. teach a method of operating a telecommunications conferencing system that includes a conference bridge having a plurality of ports. Conferencing an additional party to existing conference calls was taught in one embodiment of the invention (col. 8, line 65 through col. 9, line 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of conferencing an additional party into

Art Unit: 2642

the voice browsing session using a conference component, the conference providing a voice communications link between the calling party and the additional party, as taught by Chow, in Cohen's system in order to conference additional callers into an established voice browsing session.

Regarding claim 2, Cohen et al. teach conferencing selected ones of a plurality of additional parties ("multiple callers") into the voice browsing session (col. 4, lines 37-38).

Regarding claim 3, Cohen et al. teach a user might access content on a Voice Web site using a conventional telephone or a voice-enabled personal computer. The content may include various voice-enabled software applications which responds to a user's recognized speech (col. 2, lines 48-65), therefore speech recognition would be used as an identifier associated with the additional party. Furthermore, Chow teaches conferencing an additional party to an existing conference call (col. 8, line 65 through col. 9, line 8) reads on claimed "initiating an outbound call from the conferencing component to the additional party".

Claims 6-8 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 3, and 4. Furthermore, Cohen et al. do not teach a discriminator selectively route audio from the voice browser to at least the calling party. It would have been obvious and necessary to route audio from the voice browser to at least the calling party after adding additional party into the voice browsing session in order to establish a conference call.

Claims 9-11 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1-3. Furthermore, Cohen et al. teach a machine-readable storage, having

Art Unit: 2642

stored a computer program having a plurality of code sections executable by a machine (col. 4, lines 53-67).

3. Claims 4, 5, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,560,576) in view of Chow et al. (U.S. Patent 6,535,730) and further in view of Horn (U.S. Patent 6,178,237).

Regarding claims 4, 5, 12, and 13, Cohen et al. do not teach aggregating a voice data stream of the additional party with a voice data stream of the calling party into a single voice data stream; and sending the single voice data stream for processing to the voice browser; and sending audio from the voice browser to the calling party and the additional party.

Horn teaches a teleconferencing audio bridge and the output signals received by the participant in a teleconferencing is a selected combination of the input signals from all the participants (col. 1, lines 46-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of combining of the input signals from all the participants to produce output signals in order to allow each participant to vary the parameter for the input signals.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quynh H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-5451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.


Art Unit: 2642

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

qhn

Quynh H. Nguyen
October 14, 2003


AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600